

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 were amended.

The specification, drawings, and claims 1, 10, and 19 were objected to. Claim 1, 10, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by what the Examiner indicates as “applicant’s admitted prior art” (hereinafter “AAPA”). Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA.

### Objections to the Drawings, Specification, and Claims

The drawings, specification, and claims 1, 10, and 19 were objected to.

The drawings have been amended to show that the devices 202, 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, 216, 234, 236, 238, 240, 242, and 244 in Figure 2 are the same as 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 116, 134, 136, 138, 140, 142, and 144 in Figure 1. The drawings have been amended to show that the devices 302, 304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 316, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, and 344 in Figure 3 are the same as 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 116, 134, 136, 138, 140, 142, and 144 in Figure 1. The specification has also been amended to correct any discrepancies that resulted from this change. Device reference 212 has been amended to read as device reference 222 to agree with the designation in the specification. Applicant is not amending Figures 2 and 3 to remove the “hop-overs”. As stated in the Office Action, “hop-overs” indicate crossing wires that are not connected. Therefore, applicant fails to see the confusion as to whether the inputs for the MUX

originate from the straight wire or the “hop-over”, as the inputs obviously originate from the straight wire and not the “hop-over”.

The specification and claims 1, 10, and 19 have each been amended to overcome the listed objections for those matters.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 10, 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 10, 19 have been amended to overcome this rejection.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)**

Claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by AAPA.

AAPA does not teach or suggest the instruction pointers for the active thread are delivered to processor logic and the instruction pointers for the inactive thread are delivered to the storage element for delivery to the processor logic when the inactive thread becomes the active thread. Examiner states:

It should be noted that based on the 112 rejection above, the examiner is able to interpret “the instruction pointers for the inactive thread” as being instruction pointers belonging to an inactive thread, as described in lines 2-3 of claim 1. The instruction pointers do not necessarily have to be the same instruction pointers that are outputted by multiplexers 218 and 220.

(Office Action, p. 8).

Claims 1, 10, and 19 clearly state that the instruction pointers are, indeed, the same instruction pointers that are outputted by the multiplexers. AAPA does not show this, nor does the Office Action state that it does.

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that elements of claim 1, 10, and 19 are neither shown nor suggested by AAPA. Claims 2-4, 9, 11-13, 18, and 20-21 depend from claims 1, 10, and claim 19, respectively. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 9-13, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA.

As stated above, elements of claims 1, 24, and 29 are neither shown nor suggested by AAPA. Claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8, 14-17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: June 18, 2004

By: Stephen T. Neal  
Stephen T. Neal  
(Reg. No. 47,815)  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501